## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-47 are pending; Claims 1 and 2 are presently active; and Claims 3-47 were previously withdrawn from consideration.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by <u>Koz</u> (U.S. Pat. No. 5,990,955). For the reasons discussed below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which Claim 2 depends, recites a coating means for dividing an input moving image signal into a plurality of frame image signals, dividing each of the frame image signals into one or more area image signals, and compression coding the area image signal into an area image code string, and adding a frame header information indicating a coding mode of the frame to the area image code string. Claims 1 and 2 relate to MPEG-4, and the area image signal and coding strings to which the frame header information is added may be seen in Figs. 3A-3D.

The outstanding Office Action cites to column 4, lines 34-49 of <u>Koz</u> to support that <u>Koz</u> discloses dividing an input image signal into a plurality of frame image signals, and dividing each of the frame image signals into one or more area image signals.

However, <u>Koz</u> relates to MPEG-2. More specifically, the macro-blocks relied upon in the outstanding Office Action are described in <u>Koz</u> as being a block array representing the luminance four blocks 3/10 of pixel luminance and two blocks 3/12 representing interpolated pixel chrominance. These macro-blocks of <u>Koz</u> do not correspond to an area image signal.

Accordingly, as <u>Koz</u> fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over <u>Koz</u>. Likewise, dependent

Application No. 09/522,950 Reply to Office Action of November 19, 2003

Claim 2 is considered to patentably distinguish over <u>Koz</u> for the reasons above-noted with regard to Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters Registration No. 28,870 Attorney of Record

Katherine D. Pauley Registration No. 50,607

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

EHK:KDP\la

I:\ATTY\KDP\0039\0039 7606\0039 7606 RESP 2-13-04.DOC